# Mutual Uncertainty, Conditional Uncertainty and Strong Sub-Additivity

Sk Sazim,[1,2,3,*] Satyabrata Adhikari,[1,4] Arun Kumar Pati,[2,3,†] and Pankaj Agrawal[1,3]

[1]*Institute of Physics, Sainik School Post, Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India.*
[2]*Quantum Information and Computation Group, Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, Allahabad 211019, India.*
[3]*Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai 400085, India*
[4]*Deptartment of Mathematics, BIT Mesra, Ranchi-835215, India.*

(Dated: March 6, 2017)

Using the variance based uncertainty, we introduce a new concept called as the mutual uncertainty between two observables in a given quantum state which enjoys similar features like the mutual information for two random variables. Further, we define the conditional uncertainty and show that conditioning on more observable reduces the uncertainty. Given three observables, we prove a 'strong sub-additivity' theorem for the conditional uncertainty under certain condition. As an application, we show that for pure product two-qubit states, the mutual uncertainty is bounded by $2-\sqrt{2}=0.586$ and if it is greater than this value then it indicates that the state is entangled. For mixed two-qubit states, we prove that the mutual uncertainty for product, classical-classical, and classical-quantum state also takes a universal value $0.586$. We also show how to detect quantum steering using the mutual uncertainty between two observables. Our results may open up a new direction of exploration in quantum theory and quantum information using the mutual uncertainty, conditional uncertainty and the strong sub-additivity for multiple observables.

arXiv:1702.07576v2 [quant-ph] 3 Mar 2017

In quantum theory, Heisenberg's uncertainty relation [1] restricts the knowledge of physical observables one can have about the quantum system. The Heisenberg-Robertson uncertainty [2–5] relation suggests the impossibility of preparing an ensemble where one can measure two non-commuting observables with infinite precisions. Later, Schrödinger [6] improved the lower bound of this uncertainty relation. In fact, Robertson and Schrödinger gave the mathematical formula for the uncertainty relation in terms of the variances. Recently, the stronger uncertainty relations have been proved which go beyond the Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relation [7] and this has strengthened the notion of incompatible observables in quantum theory [8–13].

Shannon introduced entropy as a measure of information contained in a classical random variable [14]. The introduction of entropy paved a path for a new field "Classical Information Science" [15]. Later, von Neumann extended the idea of entropy to the quantum domain where one replaces the probability distribution of random variables with the density operators for the states of quantum systems. Undoubtedly, entropy is an important quantity in quantum information science [16, 17]. As entropy measures lack of information about the preparation of a system, one can also express uncertainty relations in terms of entropies [18, 19]. However, in the quantum world, variance of an observable is also a measure of lack of information about the state preparation [20]. Therefore, it may be natural to ask if using the variance based uncertainty measure one can define analogous quantities such as the mutual information, the conditional entropy and the notion of strong sub-additivity.

In this paper, we introduce the notion of mutual uncertainty, conditional uncertainty and strong sub-additivity on the basis of quantum uncertainties expressed in terms of standard deviations and variances. Interestingly, we find that the standard deviation (quantum uncertainty) behaves in many ways like entropy. We find expressions for the mutual uncertainty which serves many purposes like detecting quantum correlations [21], entanglement [22, 23], and quantum steering [24]. Then we define the conditional uncertainty from the definition of the mutual uncertainty. In particular, we show that if the mutual uncertainty is more than $2-\sqrt{2}$, then the two qubit state is entangled. One important aspect of this formalism is that one can have a version of 'strong subadditivity' for quantum uncertainties which may have implications in quantum information and this may be of independent interest.

*Sum uncertainty relations.–* Let us consider a set of observables represented by Hermitian operators $\{A_i\}$, then the uncertainty of $A_i$ in a given quantum state $\rho$ is defined as the statistical variance (Var) or standard deviation ($\triangle \equiv \sqrt{\mathrm{Var}}$) of the corresponding observable, i.e., $\mathrm{Var}(A_i)=\mathrm{Tr}(A_i^2\rho)-[\mathrm{Tr}(A_i\rho)]^2$. This positive quantity can only be zero if $\rho$ is an eigenstate of $A_i$, representing the exact predictability of the measurement outcome. Hence, a quantum state with zero uncertainty must be a simultaneous eigenstate of all $A_i$'s. The "sum uncertainty relation" [25] tells us that the sum of uncertainty of two observables is greater or equals to the uncertainty of the sum of the observables on a quantum system. If $A$ and $B$ are two general observables that represent some physical quantities, then one may ask: What is the relation between $\triangle(A+B)$, $\triangle A$, and $\triangle B$? The following theorem answers this.

**Theorem.1** [25]: *Quantum fluctuation in the sum of any two observables is always less than or equal to the sum of their individual fluctuations, i.e.,* $\triangle(A+B)\leq\triangle A+\triangle B$.

The theorem was proved for pure states only but one can easily extend the result for the arbitrary mixed states by employing the *purification of the mixed states* in higher dimensional Hilbert space. The physical meaning of the sum uncertainty relation is that *if we have an ensemble of quantum systems then the ignorance in totality is always less than the sum of the individual ignorances*. In case of two observables, if we prepare a large number of quantum systems in the state

$\rho$, and then perform the measurement of $A$ on some of those systems and $B$ on some others, then the standard deviations in $A$ plus $B$ will be more than the standard deviation in the measurement of $(A+B)$ on those systems. Hence, it is always advisable to go for the 'joint measurement' if we want to minimize the error. Another aspect of this theorem is that it is similar in spirit to the subadditivity of the von Neumann entropy, i.e., $S(\rho_{12}) \leq S(\rho_1) + S(\rho_2)$, where $\rho_{12}$ is a two particle system and $\rho_2$=$\mathrm{Tr}_1(\rho_{12})$ is the reduced density for subsystem 2. Noticing this resemblance of quantum entropy and standard deviation measure of uncertainty, it is tempting to see if we can unravel some other features. Before doing that we will first summarize the properties of the uncertainty (captured by standard deviation) [25].

*Properties of* $\triangle(\cdot)$: (i) It is convex in nature, i.e., $\triangle(\sum_i p_i A_i) \leq \sum_i p_i \triangle(A_i)$, with $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$ and (ii) one cannot decrease the uncertainty of an observable by mixing several states $\rho = \sum_\ell \lambda_\ell \rho_\ell$, i.e., $\triangle(A)_\rho \geq \sum_\ell \lambda_\ell \triangle(A)_{\rho_\ell}$, with $\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell = 1$. This is similar to the fact that entropy is also a concave function of the density matrices, i.e., $S(\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell \rho_\ell) \geq \sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S(\rho_\ell)$.

In fact, it is not difficult to see that if we have more than two observables (say three observables $A$, $B$, and $C$), then the sum uncertainty relation will read as $\triangle(A+B+C) \leq \triangle A + \triangle B + \triangle C$. In general, for observables $\{A_i\}$, we will have the sum uncertainty relation as $\triangle(\sum_i A_i) \leq \sum_i \triangle A_i$ [25].

*Mutual uncertainty*.– For any two observable A and B, the mutual uncertainty in the quantum state $\rho$ is defined as

$$M(A:B) := \triangle A + \triangle B - \triangle(A+B). \tag{1}$$

We name $M(A:B)$ as the *mutual uncertainty* in the same spirit as that of the mutual information. The mutual information for a bipartite state $\rho_{12}$ is defined as $I(\rho_{12}) = S(\rho_1) + S(\rho_2) - S(\rho_{12})$. The quantity $M(A:B)$ captures how much overlap two observables can have in a quantum state.

*Properties of* $M(A:B)$: (i) $M(A:B) \geq 0$, (ii) it is symmetric in $A$ and $B$, i.e., $M(A:B) = M(B:A)$, and (iii) $M(A:A) = 0$. Note that $I(\rho_{12})$ also satisfies similar properties.

The above definition of mutual uncertainty can be generalized for $n$ number of observables. Thus, given a set of observables $\{A_i; i = 1, 2, ..., n\}$, we have

$$M(A_1 : A_2 : ... : A_n) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle A_i - \triangle(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i). \tag{2}$$

The above relation quite resembles with the mutual information for $n$-particle quantum state $\rho_{12..n}$ which is defined as $I(\rho_{12..n}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S(\rho_i) - S(\rho_{12...n})$ [27].

Note that all the observables may not have same physical dimension but one can make them of same dimension by multiplying them with proper dimensional quantities. Although in this article we have omitted this possibility by considering dimensionless observables.

*Conditional uncertainty*.– We define a new quantity called the conditional uncertainty (similar to the conditional entropy $S(\rho_{1|2}) = S(\rho_{12}) - S(\rho_2)$) as

$$\triangle(A|B) : = \triangle(A+B) - \triangle B. \tag{3}$$

This suggest that how much uncertainty in $(A+B)$ remains after we remove the uncertainty in $B$.

*Properties of* $\triangle(A|B)$: (i)$\triangle(A|B) \leq \triangle A$. (ii) $\triangle(A|B) \geq 0$ but can be negative if $\triangle(A+B) < \triangle B$ or vice versa, (iii) $\triangle(A|A) = \triangle A$.

By noting that $\triangle(A|B) = \triangle A - M(A:B)$ and $M(A:B) \geq 0$, we have property (i). A simple example will illustrate the property (ii) [26].

Now we will derive some useful results using the mutual uncertainty and the conditional uncertainty.

**Theorem.2** *Chain rule for the sum uncertainty holds, i.e.,* $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|A_{i-1} + \cdots + A_1)$.

The proof of the theorem is given in the Appendix.1. This tells us that the sum uncertainty of two observable is equal to the uncertainty of one observable plus the conditional uncertainty of the other observables, i.e., $\triangle(A+B) = \triangle(A) + \triangle(B|A)$ which is similar to the entropy of the joint random variables or the bipartite systems.

**Corollary.1** *Chain rule for the conditional uncertainties holds also, i.e.,* $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i|X\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_{i-1})$.

The proof of the corollary is given in the Appendix.1. This result tells us that the conditional uncertainty behaves in similar fashion as the conditional entropy.

*Conditional mutual uncertainty*.– We define another quantity which we call the conditional mutual uncertainty in the same spirit of the conditional mutual information. This is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} M(A:B|C) : &= \triangle(A|C) + \triangle(B|C) - \triangle(A+B|C) \\ &= \triangle(B|C) - \triangle(B|C+A), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

using chain rule for the conditional uncertainty.

*Conditional variance*.– Here, we define the conditional variance (similar to the conditional entropy) as

$$\mathrm{Var}(A|B) := \mathrm{Var}(A+B) - \mathrm{Var}B. \tag{5}$$

This quantity is equivalent to $\mathrm{Var}(A) + \mathrm{Cov}(A,B)$, where $\mathrm{Cov}(A,B) = \mathrm{Tr}[AB\rho] - \mathrm{Tr}[A\rho]\,\mathrm{Tr}[B\rho]$ is the covariance of $A$ and $B$. It says that if the covariance is nonzero then the uncertainty in $A$ may increase or decrease due to the knowledge of the uncertainty of $B$ as covariance can take both positive (correlation) and negative (anti-correlation) values. This is in some sense different from the conditional uncertainty.

*Strong sub-additivity like relations*.– The strong subadditivity (SSA) of entropy is an important result in information science. It gives a fundamental limitation to the distribution of entropy in a composite system [28, 29]. In classical

case it implies the non-negativity of the mutual information. For the relative entropy based quantum mutual information, $I(\rho_{12..n}) = S(\rho_{12..n}||\otimes_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i)$ [30], the SSA of entropy guarantees the positivity [31] but not for the other versions of mutual information [32]. In broad sense, the SSA of entropy implies that *the conditioning will not increase the entropy*, i.e., $S(\rho_{1|23}) \leq S(\rho_{1|2})$. Moreover, beyond three particle systems we do not know the actual form of SSA of quantum entropy. Here we will prove a strong sub-additivity like relation concerning the uncertainties for multiple observables in a given quantum state.

**Theorem.3** *If $M(B:C)=0$, then $\triangle(A|B+C) \leq \triangle(A|B)$, i.e., conditioning on more observables reduces the uncertainty. This is the "Strong Sub-Additivity (SSA)" of uncertainty.*

The SSA for arbitrary number of observables is given by $\triangle(A_1|A_2+\cdots+A_n) \leq \triangle(A_1|A_2+\cdots+A_{n-1})$ if $M(A_2+\cdots+A_{n-1}:A_n)=0$, while in case of entropic SSA, we do not know its exact form beyond three parties. The proof of the theorem is given in the Appendix.1.

Next, we will prove two important relations concerning the mutual uncertainty.

**Inequality.1** Discarding the observable, one cannot increase the mutual uncertainty, i.e., $M(A:B) \leq M(A:B+C)$.

The proof of the inequality is given in the Appendix.1. This is another form of SSA in terms of mutual uncertainty. Interestingly, mutual information also satisfies $I(\rho_{12}) \leq I(\rho_{1(23)})$ [15]. Similarly, there is another total correlation measure, called as the entanglement of purification [33], that satisfies $E(\rho_{12}) \leq E(\rho_{1(23)})$ [34].

**Inequality.2** If $M(A:B)=0$ then $M(A+B:C) \geq M(A:B+C)$.

All these inequalities resemble with the well known inequalities concerning the mutual informations which are the corner stone of information science. The proofs of these inequalities are given in the Appendix.1.

In the rest part of this work, we will focus on some applications of these relations that we have proved. We will study these quantities for discrete systems such as the qubit-systems and one can easily extend them for continuous variable systems.

*Single qubit systems*.– Let us consider a general single qubit density matrix $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I}+\vec{\sigma}.\vec{r})$, where $\vec{r}=\{r_1,r_2,r_3\}$ is the Bloch vector (with $|\vec{r}|^2 \leq 1$) and $\vec{\sigma}=\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3\}$ are the Pauli matrices. The mutual uncertainty for the observables $A=\vec{\sigma}.\hat{a}$ and $B=\vec{\sigma}.\hat{b}$ in a state $\rho$ is given by

$$M(A:B) = \sqrt{1-(\hat{a}.\vec{r})^2}+\sqrt{1-(\hat{b}.\vec{r})^2} - \sqrt{4\cos^2\frac{\eta}{2}-(\hat{a}.\vec{r}+\hat{b}.\vec{r})^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\cos\eta = \hat{a}.\hat{b}$ and if $\eta=\pi$, $\hat{a}=-\hat{b}$.

The conditional uncertainty for the state $\rho$ is $\triangle(A|B) = \sqrt{4\cos^2\frac{\eta}{2}-(\hat{a}.\vec{r}+\hat{b}.\vec{r})^2} - \sqrt{1-(\hat{b}.\vec{r})^2}$, and conditional variance is $\mathrm{Var}(A|B) = 4\cos^2\frac{\eta}{2}-(\hat{b}.\vec{r})[\hat{b}.\vec{r}+2\hat{a}.\vec{r}]$.

Consider a single qubit pure state $|\chi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2-\sqrt{2})}}(|0\rangle + (\sqrt{2}-1)|1\rangle)$ and two observables $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_3$. Then the mutual uncertainty $M(\sigma_1:\sigma_3)$, conditional uncertainty $\triangle(\sigma_1|\sigma_3)$ and conditional variance $\mathrm{Var}(\sigma_1|\sigma_3)$ are $\sqrt{2}$, $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $-0.5$ respectively. Hence, the conditional uncertainty and the conditional variance may be negative for single qubit systems.

*Mutual uncertainty and entanglement*.– Entanglement is a crucial resource for many quantum information protocols (e.g., see [22]). Hence, detection and quantification of entanglement is an important task. Several ways to detect entanglement have been proposed in the recent past [23]. In the literature, the uncertainty relations have been employed to detect entanglement where operators can be either locally applied on the subsystems [35] or globally applied on the system as a whole [36]. This motivates us to ask the natural question here: Can we detect entanglement using the mutual uncertainty? Answer to this question is yes we can. The key fact in this prescription is that the quantum covariance for correlated states can be negative [37]. Hence, one can derive quantities from quantum covariance which may detect entanglement in the state [38, 39].

*Mutual uncertainty of pure two qubit product states*: Let us consider a pure two qubit product state which is of the form $\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I}+\hat{r}.\vec{\sigma})\otimes\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I}+\hat{s}.\vec{\sigma})$, where $\hat{r}$ and $\hat{s}$ are unit Bloch vectors for qubits 1 and 2 repectively. For the state $\rho_{12}$, the mutual uncertainty for two observables $\tilde{A}=A\otimes\mathbb{I}$ and $\tilde{B}=\mathbb{I}\otimes B$ is given by

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{\rho_{12}} = \sqrt{1-(\hat{a}.\hat{r})^2}+\sqrt{1-(\hat{b}.\hat{s})^2} - \sqrt{2+2(\hat{a}.\hat{r})(\hat{b}.\hat{s})-(\hat{a}.\hat{r}+\hat{b}.\hat{s})^2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ are unit vectors in $R^3$.

Let $\hat{a}.\hat{r}=\cos\theta$ and $\hat{b}.\hat{s}=\cos\phi$, $\theta$ being the angle between the unit vectors $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{r}$ and $\phi$ being the angle between the unit vectors $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{s}$. The value of $M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{\rho_{12}}$ can be re-expressed as

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{\rho_{12}} = |\sin\theta|+|\sin\phi|-\sqrt{\sin^2\theta+\sin^2\phi}, \quad (8)$$

where $|X|$ denotes the absolute value of $X$. It can be checked that the maximum value of the mutual uncertainty with respect to the pure two qubit product state is given by $2-\sqrt{2}=0.586$. This result tells us that if the mutual uncertainty with respect to a given pure state is found to be greater than $2-\sqrt{2}=0.586$ then the given pure state is entangled. This gives a sufficient condition for the detection of pure entangled state. Thus, we can say that the mutual uncertainty between two observables can detect pure entangled state. This may provide direct detection of entangled states in real experiment.

*Mutual uncertainty of pure two qubit entangled states*: Let us consider a two qubit entangled state in Schmidt decomposition form, i.e., $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda}|00\rangle+\sqrt{1-\lambda}|11\rangle$. The mutual uncertainty for the observables $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ in the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is

given by

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{|\Psi\rangle} = t_1 + t_2 - \sqrt{t_1^2 + t_2^2 + 2C(t + Ca_z b_z)}, \quad (9)$$

where $t_1 = \sqrt{1-(1-C^2)a_z^2}$, $t_2 = \sqrt{1-(1-C^2)b_z^2}$ and $t = a_x b_x - a_y b_y$, and $C = 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}$ is the concurrence [40] of $|\Psi\rangle$. Hence, the mutual uncertainty for entangled state is a function of concurrence and the choice of observables.

*Mutual uncertainty of pure two qubit entangled states under certain condition*: Next, we will show that the concurrence of the pure entangled states can be measured experimentally just by measuring the two observables involved in the mutual uncertainty. For simplicity, we will use here the constraint equation used by Beigi [38], i.e., $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 A) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 B) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 AA^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 BB^\dagger) = 1$ where 1, 2 denotes subsystems. Hence, the mutual uncertainty (Eq. (9)) for the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is given by

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{|\Psi\rangle} = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2Ct}. \quad (10)$$

Interestingly, from the above relation one can see that by measuring the mutual uncertainty between two observable one can directly infer the concurrence as $C = \frac{1}{2t}[2 + M(M-4)]$. One can easily check that $C = 0$ (if $M = 2 - \sqrt{2}$), irrespective of any non-zero $t$ value. Note that $t$ depends on the choice of observables.

*Mutual uncertainty of two qubit mixed states under certain condition*: Let us consider a two-qubit state in the canonical form

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\mu,\nu=0}^{3} \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}\sigma_\mu \otimes \sigma_\nu, \quad (11)$$

where $(\sigma_\mu; \mu = 0, .., 3)$ are the Pauli matrices and $\Lambda_{\mu,\nu} = \mathrm{Tr}[(\sigma_\mu \otimes \sigma_\nu)\rho_{12}]$ are real with condition $\sum |\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}|^2 \leq 4$. In block matrix form $\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s^T \\ r & T \end{pmatrix}$, where $\vec{r}$, $\vec{s}$ are Bloch vectors for subsystems 1 and 2 respectively and $T = [\Lambda_{ij}]$ is $3 \times 3$ correlation matrix [41].

The mutual uncertainty for the observables $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ is given by

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B}) = \sqrt{1-(\hat{a}.\vec{r})^2} + \sqrt{1-(\hat{b}.\vec{s})^2} - \sqrt{2 + 2\sum \Lambda_{ij}a_i b_j - (\hat{a}.\vec{r} + \hat{b}.\vec{s})^2}. \quad (12)$$

Now under the above constraints, the mutual uncertainty becomes

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B}) = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2\sum \Lambda_{ij}a_i b_j}. \quad (13)$$

Now we address the question: what will be the value of $M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})$ for the pure product, classical-classical and classical-quantum states under the constraints.

**Proposition.1** *For two-qubit product states ($\rho_{pro}$), classical-classical states ($\rho_{cl}$) and classical-quantum states ($\rho_{CQ}$) $M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B}) = 2 - \sqrt{2}$, under the condition* $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 A) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 B) = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 AA^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 BB^\dagger) = 1$ *where* 1, 2 *denotes subsystems and* $\tilde{A} = A \otimes \mathbb{I}$, $\tilde{B} = \mathbb{I} \otimes B$.

*Proof*: In canonical representation, $\rho_{pro} = |\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1| \otimes |\varpi_1\rangle\langle\varpi_1| = \{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_1\vec{e}_2^T\}$, $\rho_{cl} = p|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1| \otimes |\varpi_1\rangle\langle\varpi_1| + (1-p)|\varphi_2\rangle\langle\varphi_2| \otimes |\varpi_2\rangle\langle\varpi_2| = \{\beta\vec{e}_1, \beta\vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_1\vec{e}_2^T\}$ and $\rho_{CQ} = p|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1| \otimes \rho_1 + (1-p)|\varphi_2\rangle\langle\varphi_2| \otimes \rho_2 = \{\beta\vec{e}_1, \vec{v}_+, \vec{e}_1\vec{v}_-^T\}$, where $\beta = 2p-1$, $\vec{e}_1 = \langle\varphi_1|\vec{\sigma}|\varphi_1\rangle$, $\vec{e}_2 = \langle\varpi_1|\vec{\sigma}|\varpi_1\rangle$, and $\vec{v}_\pm = \mathrm{Tr}[(p\rho_1 \pm (1-p)\rho_2)\vec{\sigma}]$ with $\langle\varphi_i|\varphi_j\rangle = \langle\varpi_i|\varpi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_1\rho_2] \neq 0$. Then from the above constraint it is straightforward to conclude that $\sum \Lambda_{ij}a_i b_j = 0$ for all these states. Hence, the proposition.

The above proposition is true for quantum-classical states also. Let us consider a quantum-quantum state of the form $\rho_Q = p|00\rangle\langle 00| + (1-p)|++\rangle\langle++|$ where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ which has non-zero discord. For this state, the mutual uncertainty is $M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B}) = 2 - \sqrt{2[1 + \{p/(1-p)\}a_z b_z]}$.

The mutual uncertainty for the pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ is given in Eq.(10). Using convex roof extension method, one can find the mutual uncertainty of a two qubit mixed state of the form $\rho = \sum_i p_i|\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|$, i.e., $M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_\rho = \min \sum_i M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_{|\Psi_i\rangle}$, which would give

$$M(\tilde{A}:\tilde{B})_\rho = 2 - \max_{\{p_i, |\Psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i \sqrt{2 + 2C(|\Psi_i\rangle)t_i}, \quad (14)$$

where $t_i = a_x^i b_x^i - a_y^i b_y^i$ and $a_x^i$,$a_y^i$, $b_x^i$,$b_y^i$ are the components of the measurement vectors for the $i^{th}$ ensemble of particles. If we consider $t_i \neq 0$ and not all two qubit states are separable in the ensemble, then the term $2 - \max_{\{p_i, |\Psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i \sqrt{2 + 2C(|\Psi_i\rangle)t_i}$ will never be equal to $2 - \sqrt{2}$.

**Corollary.2** *For mixed two-qubit bipartite state $\rho$, under the condition* $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 A) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 B) = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 AA^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 BB^\dagger) = 1$, *uncertainty relation reads,* $\triangle\tilde{A}\triangle\tilde{B} \geq \min_{\{p_i, |\Psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i C(|\Psi_i\rangle)t_i$ *and for pure bipartite state,* $|\Psi\rangle$, $\triangle\tilde{A}\triangle\tilde{B} \geq C(|\Psi\rangle)t$, *where* 1, 2 *denotes subsystems and* $\tilde{A} = A \otimes \mathbb{I}$, $\tilde{B} = \mathbb{I} \otimes B$.

Here we have used the fact that $\triangle\tilde{A}\triangle\tilde{B} \geq \mathrm{Cov}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$.

*Mutual uncertainty and steering*.– Quantum steering is one kind of non-local phenomenon introduced by Schrödinger [24] while reinterpreting the EPR-paradox [42]. The presence of entanglement between two subsystems in a bipartite state enables one to control the state of one subsystem by its entangled counter part [24, 43]. Later, it was mathematically formulated in Refs. [44, 45]. Let Alice prepares an entangled state $\rho_{12}$ and sends one particle to Bob. Her job is to convince Bob that they are sharing non-local correlations (entanglement). Bob will believe such a claim if his state cannot be expressed by local hidden state model, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\rho}_1^e = \sum_\mu p(\mu)\mathcal{P}(e|E,\mu)\rho_2^Q(\mu), \quad (15)$$

where $F = \{p(\mu), \rho_2^Q(\mu)\}$ is an ensemble prepared by Alice and $\mathcal{P}(e|E,\mu)$ is Alice's stochastic map. Here, $p(\mu)$ is the distribution of hidden variable $\mu$ with constraint $\sum_\mu p(\mu) = 1$

and $E$ denotes all possible projective measurements for Alice. Conversely, if Bob cannot find such $F$ and $\mathcal{P}(e|E,\mu)$, then, he must admit that Alice can steer his system. Below, we present a strategy to detect quantum steering using the mutual uncertainty.

**Strategy**: In order to steer Bob's subsystem, Alice performs measurement on her qubit and she may communicate the outcomes to Bob. Let us assume that Alice makes measurement with projectors $E_n^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}[\mathbb{I} + (-1)^\alpha \hat{n}.\vec{\sigma}]$ that results with outcome $\alpha = 0/1$, then Bob's state will be given by

$$\rho_{2|E_n^\alpha} = \frac{1}{2\xi}\left[\xi\mathbb{I} + \vec{\sigma}.\vec{s} + (-1)^\alpha \sum_j \Lambda_{\hat{n}j}\sigma_j\right], \qquad (16)$$

where $\xi = 1 + (-1)^\alpha \hat{n}.\vec{r}$. For this state the quantity $M(\sigma_l : \sigma_k)$ can be calculated by Bob using the measurement outcomes of Alice, and we find that

$$\begin{aligned} M(\sigma_l : \sigma_k)_{\rho_{2|E_n^\alpha}} &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\xi^2}\left(s_l + (-1)^\alpha \Lambda_{\hat{n}l}\right)^2} \\ &+ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\xi^2}\left(s_k + (-1)^\alpha \Lambda_{\hat{n}k}\right)} \\ &- \sqrt{2 - \frac{1}{\xi^2}\left[s_l + s_k + (-1)^\alpha(\Lambda_{\hat{n}l} + \Lambda_{\hat{n}k})\right]^2}, \end{aligned} \qquad (17)$$

where $l \neq k$. Let us consider the following quantity, $\eta = M(\sigma_1 : \sigma_2) + M(\sigma_2 : \sigma_3) + M(\sigma_3 : \sigma_1)$. For single qubit states, the quantity $\eta$ is bounded by

$$\eta \geq (2 - \sqrt{2}). \qquad (18)$$

Then Bob will calculate the quantity $\eta$. If Alice can control Bob's local state, she may have influences on the bound of $\eta$. Hence, the violation of the above inequality (18) by a system confirms that the system cannot be expressed by Eq.(15), i.e., the steering inequality reads as

$$\eta < (2 - \sqrt{2}). \qquad (19)$$

*Example.1:* Consider two-qubit pure state in the Schmidt decomposition form, i.e., $|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-\lambda}|11\rangle$, $\lambda$ being the Schmidt coefficient and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. The state in canonical form is $r_3 = s_3 = 2\lambda - 1$, $\Lambda_{11} = -\Lambda_{22} = 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}$, and $\Lambda_{33} = 1$. Now Alice makes measurement in three basis, i.e., $E_i^\alpha; \{i = 1,2,3\}$ and Bob's particle will end up in the states $\rho_{B|E_i^\alpha}; \{i = 1,2,3\}$, respectively. Now he will calculate the quantity $\eta = M(\sigma_1 : \sigma_2)_{\rho_{2|E_1^\alpha}} + M(\sigma_2 : \sigma_3)_{\rho_{2|E_2^\alpha}} + M(\sigma_3 : \sigma_1)_{\rho_{2|E_3^\alpha}}$, which comes out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{|\Psi\rangle} &= 2 + \sqrt{f_\lambda} - \sqrt{2 - g_{a\lambda}^2} + 2\sqrt{1 - f_\lambda} \\ &- \sqrt{2 - f_\lambda} + \sqrt{1 - f_{a\lambda}^2} - \sqrt{2 - f_{a\lambda}^2}, \end{aligned} \qquad (20)$$

where $f_\lambda = 4\lambda(1-\lambda)$, $f_{a\lambda} = \frac{(-1)^\alpha + 2\lambda - 1}{(-1)^\alpha(2\lambda-1)+1}$ and $g_{a\lambda} = 2(-1)^\alpha\sqrt{(1-\lambda)\lambda} + 2\lambda - 1$. Thus, $\eta$ is given by

$$\eta_{|\Psi\rangle} < 2 - \sqrt{2} \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \alpha = 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.6, \\ \alpha = 1 \text{ and } 0.4 \leq \lambda \leq 1. \end{cases} \qquad (21)$$

Hence, the state will be steerable for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ depending on the measurement outcome '$\alpha$' (which Alice may classically communicate to Bob).

*Example.2:* Next we will discuss the steerability of Werner state $\rho_W = p|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-| + \frac{1-p}{4}\mathbb{I}_4$, where $|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ and $\mathbb{I}_4$ is a identity matrix of order 4. The canonical representation of $\rho_W$ is $\vec{r} = \vec{s} = 0$, and $\Lambda_{11} = \Lambda_{22} = p$ and $\Lambda_{33} = -p$. The state $\rho_W$ is entangled for $p > \frac{1}{3}$, steerable when Bob checks Alice's control on the system $B$ for $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and Bell non-local for $p > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

In order to see whether the state is steerable, Alice will take an optimal strategy of measuring her system on the basis $E_{ij}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}[E_i^\alpha + E_j^\alpha]$ $(ij = 12, 23, 13)$ and according to measurement outcome Bob will end up with his system. Then Bob will measure the quantity $\gamma = -M(\sigma_1 : \sigma_2)_{\rho_{2|E_{12}^\alpha}} + M(\sigma_2 : \sigma_3)_{\rho_{2|E_{23}^\alpha}} + M(\sigma_3 : \sigma_1)_{\rho_{2|E_{13}^\alpha}}$ (here the quantity $\gamma$ for single particle system can take values $\geq \sqrt{2} - 2$, violation of which means the system cannot be expressed by Eq.(15)) which is

$$\gamma_{\rho_W} = 2\sqrt{1 - (p^2/2)} + \sqrt{2 - 2p^2} - 2\sqrt{2}. \qquad (22)$$

Hence, the state will show steerability, i.e., $\gamma_{\rho_W} < \sqrt{2} - 2$ if $p > \frac{2}{7}\sqrt{2(9\sqrt{2} - 8)}$. Though, there exist other methods of detecting quantum steering [44–49], this provides an alternate approach based on the mutual uncertainty.

*Discussions and conclusions.*– We have defined a new quantity called as the mutual uncertainty which may be useful in many ways to develop a faithful notion in quantum information theory. In doing so we have been able to prove many results similar to that of entropic ones such as the conditional uncertainty, strong sub-additivity relations for the variances. Our result clearly indicates that the variance-based uncertainty may be treated on equal footing like entropies. We have also shown that the mutual uncertainty is useful to witness entanglement and quantum steering phenomenon. For pure bipartite states, we have shown that by measuring the mutual uncertainty one can infer the concurrence. We hope that these notions may find host of other applications in quantum theory, quantum information and quantum communication.

*Acknowledgement.*– SS would like to thank Dr. Tanumoy Pramanik for having useful discussions on steering. AKP gratefully acknowledges the local hospitality during his visits at IOP, Bhubaneswar during 2014-2016 where this work has been initiated. We would like to thank S. K. Choudhary for many stimulating feedback.

* Electronic address: sk.sazimsq49@gmail.com
† Electronic address: akpati@hri.res.in

[1] W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **43**, 172 (1927).
[2] E. H. Kennard, Z. Phys. **44**, 326 (1927).
[3] J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, *Quantum theory and measurement*, Princeton series in physics, Princeton university press, 1983.

[4] H. P. Robertson, Phys. Rev. **35**, 667 (1930).
[5] D. Sen, Current Science **107**, 203 (2014).
[6] E. Schrödinger, Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Physikalisch-mathematische Klasse **14**, 296 (1930).
[7] L. Maccone and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 260401 (2014).
[8] Q.-C. Song and C.-F. Qiao, arXiv: 1504.01137 (2015).
[9] K. Wang, X. Zhan, Z. Bian, J. Li, Y. Zhang, and P. Xue, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 052108 (2016).
[10] Y. Xiao and N. Jing, Scientific Report **6**, 36616 (2016).
[11] J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and C. Yu, arXiv: 1607.08223 (2016).
[12] Y. Xiao, N. Jing, X. Li-Jost and S. M. Fei, Scientific Report **6**, 23201 (2016).
[13] T. Li, Y. Xiao, T. Ma, S. M. Fei, N. Jing, X. Li-Jost, and Z.-X. Wang, Scientific Report **6**, 23201 (2016).
[14] C. E. Shannon, The Bell System Technical Journal, **27**, 379 (1948).
[15] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, USA, (1991).
[16] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge), (2000).
[17] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory*, Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge), (2013).
[18] H. Maassen and J. B. M. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1103 (1988).
[19] P. J. Coles, M. Berta, M. Tomamichel, and S. Wehner, arXiv: 1511.04857 (2015).
[20] Variance and entropy are closely related, eg., see the Refs. – Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 024101 (2012); G. Tóth, arXiv: 1701.07461.
[21] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
[22] Horodecki R., Horodecki P., Horodecki M., and Horodecki K., Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2007).
[23] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Phys. Rep. **474** 1 (2009).
[24] E. Schrödinger, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 553 (1935); **32**, 446 (1936).
[25] A. K. Pati and P. K. Sahu, Phys. Lett. A **367**, 177 (2007).
[26] As an illustration of the fact that $\triangle(A|B) < 0$, let us consider a Harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2}P^2 + \frac{1}{2}X^2$. Let $A = \frac{1}{2}P^2$ and $B = \frac{1}{2}X^2$. With this choice, one can see the quantity $\triangle(A|B)$ can be negative. For example, if $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian then $\triangle(A+B) = 0$ while $\triangle B$ is positive, and hence $\triangle(A|B)$ can be negative.
[27] There exist no unique multiparticle generalization of quantum mutual information. We have considered the relative distance based one proposed in [30].
[28] H. Araki and H. Lieb, Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 160 (1970).
[29] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1938 (1973).
[30] B. Groisman, S. Popescu, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032317 (2005).
[31] F Herbut, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, 3535 (2004).
[32] Sk Sazim and Pankaj Agrawal, arXiv: 1607.05155 (2016).
[33] B. M. Terhal, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, and D. P. DiVincenzo, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4286 (2002).
[34] S. Bagchi and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042323 (2015).
[35] H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 032103 (2003).
[36] O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 117903 (2004).
[37] A. R. Usha Devi, R. Prabhu, and A. K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 060501 (2007).
[38] S. Beigi, IEEE Xplore: in the proceedings of 2014 Iran Workshop on Communication and Information Theory (IWCIT) pp. 1-6 (2014); arXiv: 1405.2502 .
[39] P. Agrawal, S. Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, and A. K. Pati, Int. J. Quantum Inform. **14**, 1640034 (2016).
[40] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997); W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[41] R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1838 (1996).
[42] A. Einstein, D. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[43] M. D. Reid Phys. Rev. A **40**, 913 (1989).
[44] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
[45] S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052116 (2007).
[46] T. Pramanik, M. Kaplan, and A. S. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 050305(R) (2014).
[47] D. Cavalcanti and P. Skrzypczyk, arXiv: 1604.00501 (2016).
[48] C.-Y. Hsieh, Y.-C. Liang, and R.-K. Lee, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 062120 (2016).
[49] D. Mondal, T. Pramanik, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 010301(R) (2017).


### Appendix.1: Proof of theorems, corollaries and inequalities

Here, we will prove the theorems, lemas, corollaries and inequalities which we have discussed in the main article. We will start with Theorem 2.

**Theorem.2** *Chain rule for the sum uncertainty holds, i.e.,* $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|A_{i-1} + \cdots + A_1)$.

*Proof:* For three observables, the chain rule reads as

$$\triangle(A+B+C) = \triangle A + \triangle(B|A) + \triangle(C|A+B). \tag{A-1}$$

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} RHS &= \triangle A + \triangle(B|A) + \triangle(C|A+B) \\ &= \triangle A + \triangle(B+A) - \triangle A + \triangle(C+A+B) \\ &- \triangle(A+B) \\ &= \triangle(C+A+B) = LHS. \end{aligned} \tag{A-2}$$

Similarly, one can prove by mathematical induction, that the theorem holds for all positive integer $n$.

**Corollary.1** *Chain rule for the conditional uncertainties holds also, i.e.,* $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i|X\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_{i-1})$.

*Proof:* For three observables, the chain rule reads,

$$\triangle(A+B|X) = \triangle(A|X) + \triangle(B|X+A). \tag{A-3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} LHS &= \triangle(A+B|X) \\ &= \triangle(A+B+X) - \triangle X \\ &= \triangle(A+B+X) - \triangle(A+X) + \triangle(A+X) - \triangle X \\ &= \triangle(A|X) + \triangle(B|X+A) = RHS. \end{aligned} \tag{A-4}$$

Similarly, one can prove in general, for $n$ observables. Let us assume that $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i|X\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_{i-1})$ holds. Then we have to prove that $\triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} A_i|X\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \triangle(A_i|X+A_1+\cdots+A_{i-1})$.

$$\begin{aligned} LHS &= \triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} A_i|X\right) \\ &= \triangle\left((\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i + A_{n+1})|X\right) \\ &= \triangle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i|X\right) \\ &+ \triangle\left(A_{n+1}|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_n\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \triangle(A_i|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_{i-1}) \\ &+ \triangle\left(A_{n+1}|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_n\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \triangle(A_i|X + A_1 + \cdots + A_{i-1}) \\ &= RHS \end{aligned} \tag{A-5}$$

Hence, by mathematical induction, we can see that the corollary holds for all positive integer $n$.

**Theorem.3** *If $M(B:C) = 0$, then $\triangle(A|B+C) \leq \triangle(A|B)$, i.e., conditioning on more observables reduces the uncertainty. This is the "Strong Sub-Additivity (SSA)" of uncertainty.*

*Proof:* Lets start with the sum uncertainty relation, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle(A+B+C) &\leq \triangle(A+B) + \triangle C \\ \triangle(A+B+C) - \triangle(B+C) &\leq \triangle(A+B) - \triangle B \\ &+ \triangle B + \triangle C - \triangle(B+C) \\ \triangle(A|B+C) &\leq \triangle(A|B) + M(B:C) \end{aligned} \tag{A-6}$$

Hence, the proof. The proof of SSA for three observables is easy so is for arbitrary number of observables, i.e., $\triangle(A_1|A_2 + \cdots + A_n) \leq \triangle(A_1|A_2 + \cdots + A_{n-1})$ if $M(A_2 + \cdots + A_{n-1} : A_n) = 0$, while in the case of entropic SSA we do not know its exact form beyond three parties as well as the complicacy in proving them.

**Inequality.1** *Discarding the observable one cannot increase the mutual uncertainty, i.e., $M(A:B) \leq M(A:B+C)$.*

*Proof:* To prove this, let us start with the quantity $M(A:B+C)$.

$$\begin{aligned} M(A:B+C) &= \triangle A + \triangle(B+C) - \triangle(A+B+C) \\ \triangle(A+B+C) &= \triangle A + \triangle(B+C) - M(A:B+C) \\ &\leq \triangle A + \triangle B + \triangle C - M(A:B+C) \\ &\leq M(A:B) + \triangle(A+B) + \triangle C - M(A:B+C) \\ &\leq (\triangle A + \triangle B + \triangle C) - (M(A:B+C) - M(A:B)). \end{aligned} \tag{A-7}$$

Using the sum uncertainty relation for three observables

$$\triangle(A+B+C) \leq \triangle A + \triangle B + \triangle C \tag{A-8}$$

and Eq.(A-7), we get

$$M(A:B+C) - M(A:B)) \geq 0. \tag{A-9}$$

Hence the proof.

**Inequality.2** *If $M(A:B) = 0$, then $M(A+B:C) \geq M(A:B+C)$.*

*Proof:* To prove this, lets start with the quantity,

$$\begin{aligned} M(A:B+C) &= \triangle A + \triangle(B+C) - \triangle(A+B+C) \\ &\leq \triangle A + \triangle B + \triangle C - \triangle(A+B+C) \\ &\leq M(A:B) + \triangle(A+B) + \triangle C \\ &- \triangle(A+B+C) \\ &\leq M(A:B) + M(A+B:C) \end{aligned} \tag{A-10}$$

Hence the proof.

### Appendix.2: Conditional variance and "stronger uncertainty relations"

In the main text, we have introduced a new quantity in the same spirit as that of the conditional entropy, the conditional variance, i.e., $\mathrm{Var}(A|B) := \mathrm{Var}(A+B) - \mathrm{Var}B$. The quantity $\mathrm{Var}(A|B)$ might be useful for other purposes in QIP like the conditional uncertainty, i.e., $\triangle(A|B)$ but here we will focus on an important aspect of it. Recently, Maccone and Pati proved the "stronger uncertainty relation" in terms of the variance of the observables [7]. The uncertainty relation reads

$$\mathrm{Var}(A) + \mathrm{Var}(B) \geq \max[\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2], \tag{A-11}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1 = i\langle\psi|[A,B]|\psi\rangle + \langle\psi|(A+iB)|\psi^{\perp}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{1}{2}|\langle\psi^{\perp}_{A+B}|(A+B)|\psi\rangle|^2$ with $|\psi^{\perp}_{A+B}\rangle \propto (A+B-\langle(A+B)\rangle)|\psi\rangle$ is a state orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$. In this case the system under consideration is in the state $|\psi\rangle$, and $|\psi^{\perp}\rangle$ is its orthogonal state. The stronger uncertainty relations in terms of the conditional variances can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Var}(A|C) + \mathrm{Var}(B|C) &\geq \max\left[\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2\right] + \mathrm{Cov}(A,C) \\ &+ \mathrm{Cov}(B,C). \end{aligned} \tag{A-12}$$

**Appendix.3: Mutual uncertainty for some class of states**

Consider two classes of mixed two qubit states, namely, the Werner state and the Bell diagonal state. Under the conditions, $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 A) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 B) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1 A A^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_2 B B^\dagger) = 1$, we will evaluate the mutual uncertainties for $\tilde{A} = A \otimes \mathbb{I}$ and $\tilde{B} = \mathbb{I} \otimes B$ in these states, where the observables are $A = \vec{\sigma}.\hat{a}$ and $B = \vec{\sigma}.\hat{b}$.

*Bell diagonal state*: For the Bell diagonal state, $\rho_{Bell} = \frac{1}{4}[\mathbb{I} + \sum_i c_i \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_i]$, the concurrence is $C(\rho_{Bell}) = \max[0, \frac{1}{4}(1 - c_1 - c_2 - c_3)]$. Now, the mutual uncertainty for $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ in the state $\rho_{Bell}$ is $M(\tilde{A} : \tilde{B}) = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2(c_1 a_x b_x + c_2 a_y b_y + c_3 a_z b_z)}$. The mutual uncertainty depends on the component wise overlap between two observables and the state parameters. Now one can employ Chebyshev's inequality which states that if $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq ... \geq x_n$ and $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq ... \geq y_n$ then $n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \geq \sum_i x_i \sum_i y_i$ holds. The equality holds if either all $x_i$ or all $y_i$ are same. Using the inequality one can rewrite the mutual uncertainty

$$M(\tilde{A} : \tilde{B})_{\rho_{Bell}} = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2(c_1 + c_2 + c_3)k}, \quad \text{(A-13)}$$

under the constraint $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq c_3$ and $a_x b_x = a_y b_y = a_z b_z = k$. This provides a relation between concurrence and mutual uncertainty for the Bell diagonal states. Therefore, one can estimate the entanglement of the Bell diagonal state from the value of its mutual uncertainty.

*Werner state*: The Werner state is given by $\rho_W = p|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-| + \frac{1-p}{4}\mathbb{I}_4$, where $|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ and $\mathbb{I}_4$ is a identity matrix of order $4$. The concurrence of the Werner state is $C(\rho_W) = \max[0, \frac{3p-1}{2}]$. The mutual uncertainty for $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ in the state $\rho_W$ is

$$M(\tilde{A} : \tilde{B})_{\rho_W} = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2p\cos\eta}, \quad \text{(A-14)}$$

where $\eta$ is the angle between $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$. Using mutual uncertainty of the Werner state one may infer its entanglement provided $\cos\eta \neq 0$ (by suitable choice of observables).